

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	TILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,891 07/17/2003		07/17/2003	Graham Alan March	GAM 6410.1	2751
321	7590	10/12/2006		EXAMINER	
SENNIGE			KANTAMNENI, SHOBHA		
ONE METR		AN SQUARE	ART UNIT	. PAPER NUMBER	
ST LOUIS,		02	1617		
			DATE MAILED: 10/12/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		,,
	/	w
-	٤.	11
•	١	٠.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Community	10/622,891	MARCH, GRAHAM ALAN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Shobha Kantamneni	1617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim  rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-62 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceed applicant may not request that any objection to the orange Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the orange and the correction of the orange replacement drawing sheet are objected to by the Example 11).	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te				

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is in response to the application filed on 0717/2003, and claims benefit of 60/397,828 filed on 07/23/2002. Claims 1-62 are pending.

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-32, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising sodium 4-phenylbutyrate, an effective amount of aromatic flavoring agent, and an effective amount of sweetening agent classified in class 514, subclass 557, 568.
- II. Claims 33-49 drawn to a method of treating a patient suffering from condition such as urea cycle deficiency, sickle cell anaemia, comprises administering to the patient a pharmaceutical composition comprising sodium 4-phenylbutyrate, sweetening agent, fruit flavoring agent classified in class 514, subclass 815.
- III. Claim 50-62 drawn to a method of manufacturing a pharmaceutical composition comprising sodium 4-phenylbutyrate, sweetening agent, fruit flavoring agent classified in class 424, subclass 400.

Inventions I, and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different

process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case hydroxyurea can be used for treating sickle cell anaemia.

Inventions I, and III are related as product and process of making the product. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the composition can be made by simply mixing 4-phenylbutyrate, aromatic flavoring agent and sweetening agent in addition to the methods described in claims 50-62.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have <u>different modes of operation</u>. Group III drawn to the method of making a pharmaceutical composition has different mode of operation from the method of treating a condition such as sickle cell anaemia.

Each above product, method of making a product, and method of using the product relates to a separate and distinct area of pharmaceutical technology. Also each group listed above involves compounds which are recognized in the art as being distinct because of their diverse chemical structure and properties. The search for all inventions would place an undue burden on the office in view of the diversity of compositions, method of making, and using the composition and the corresponding diversity in the field of search for each.

Art Unit: 1617

Further, a search for the invention of the 3 groups would not be coextensive because a search indicating the process is novel or unobvious would not extend to a holding that the product itself is novel or unobvious; similarly, a search indicating that the product is known or would have been obvious would not extend to a holding that the process is known or would have been obvious. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

In addition, because of different classification of Groups, for example, Invention I drawn to a pharmaceutical composition is classified in class 514, subclass 557, Invention II drawn to a method of treatment of a condition is classified in 514, subclass 815, Invention III drawn to process for preparing the pharmaceutical composition is classified in 424, subclass 400, an undue burden is imposed on the Office to perform a search in both the patent and non-patent literature.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Art Unit: 1617

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one or more claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

because the above restriction/election requirement is complex, a telephone call to the applicant's agent to request an oral election was not made. See M.P.E.P Sec. 812.01.

Art Unit: 1617

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shobha Kantamneni whose telephone number is 571-272-2930. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday on 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shobha Kantamneni Patent Examiner Art Unit 1617

> SREENI PADMANABHAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER